

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6, -15 and 17-19 have been amended. Claim 5 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 20 is newly added. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,838,819 to Ruedisueli et al., hereafter Ruedisueli. This rejection is moot as to claim 5, which has been canceled.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the combination of a computing device and a computing device input system. The computing device input system records a physical writing using an electronic pen and in response to a user input selects a region of the recorded physical writing.

Claim 1 further recites that the computing device comprises a GUI and a display screen wherein the GUI presents on the display screen a windowing GUI with a paper metaphor with user selectable actions. Claim 1 further recites that the computing device also comprises an object creation manager that creates a visual object representation of the selected region and displays on the display screen a graphical element of the object representation.

Claim 1 further recites that the computing device includes an object support component of the GUI that supports use of the object representation by the GUI so as to enable a user selection of at least one of the actions to perform the selected action for the graphical element. Similar amendments have been made to independent claims 11 and 17.

Thus, claim 1 recites the combination of a computing device input system that records and selects a region of a physical writing and a computing system that displays on a display screen thereof a GUI with user selectable actions and a graphical element of the selected region and that responsive to a user selection of at least one of the actions performs the selected action for the graphical element.

In contrast, Ruedisueli discloses a notepad 10 that uses special software to locally record handwritings with embedded markers for pages and the like and to download the recorded data to a computer, which also contains software to perform merging of the handwriting data. Notepad 10 may use action icons to assist the user in locally managing the handwriting as noted at column 10, lines 7-11. However, Ruedisueli does not teach that the computer includes a GUI, an object creation manager or an object support manager as claimed in amended claim 1. Further, Ruedisueli does not teach the claimed interrelation of the action items selected from the GUI of the computer with a selected region of the handwriting to perform a selected action for a graphical element of the object representation of the selected region of the handwriting.

Thus, Ruedisueli lacks the combination of a computing device input system and computing device as claimed in amended claim 1. In particular, Ruedisueli lacks a computing device comprising a GUI, an object creation manager and an object support manager as claimed in amended claim 1.

With respect to amended claims 11 and 17, Ruedisueli lacks the steps of creating a visual object representation, displaying and supporting.

The Examiner contends at page 2 of the Office Action that Ruedisueli teaches .. "an object support component of said GUI that supports use of said created object representation by said GUI to perform said action (Ruedisueli, col

6, lines 13 -25)"

However those lines from Ruedisueli actually say:

"Electronic notepad 10 stores every session of handwritten notes in a single data file in memory 16. A session corresponding to additional notes are stored in a separate section of the single data file, and with each session included in an electronic page corresponding to a page of notes identified with a respective identifier."

This paragraph therefore does not teach creation of a GUI object that performs the action in the GUI. Rather, the paragraph talks about the storage of the notes in pages.

The Examiner contends at page 3 of the Office Action that:

"Ruedisueli teaches the computing system of claim 1 wherein said object support component of said GUI supports said action of said created object representation as a clipboard element that can be pasted into an application (Ruedisueli, col 1 , lines 62-65)."

These lines actually say"

"Each electronic copy is associated with a respective identifier corresponding to at least one set of the respective handwritten notes, in which the identifiers facilitate the management of the electronic copies".

Electronic copies are very different than "clipboard elements". A "clipboard element" is well known by those in the art to be a special element of a GUI system since it can be accessed by all of the programs in the system, not just the "electronic notepad" as is described by Ruedisueli.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Ruedisueli is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

Newly presented claim 20 recites the combination of a computing device and a computing device input system in which a GUI of the computing device is extended to the computing device input system. Ruedisueli does not teach extending a GUI of a computer to notepad 10. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 20 distinguishes from the cited art and is, therefore, allowable.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn, that claims 1-4 and 6-20 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8-19-04

Robert R. Hubbard

Robert R. Hubbard

Reg. No. 22,438

Attorney for Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

(203) 327-4500